

REMARKS

Claim 1 is currently amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments contained herein are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and do not contain new matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beerling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,508,536). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as currently amended, recites providing a mold for dispensing an encapsulant on top of an electrical coupling to form a substantially co-planar surface with an upper surface of the fluid ejecting substrate and an upper surface of the carrier that faces in the same direction as the upper surfaces of the fluid ejecting substrate and the carrier. Beerling et al. does not include or suggest this.

The Examiner has taken the carrier substrate 20 of Figure 10 as corresponding to the carrier of claim 1, the printhead die 18 (18') as corresponding to the fluid ejecting substrate of claim 1, a wire 112 as corresponding to the electrical coupling of claim 1, and encapsulant 124 as corresponding to the encapsulant of claim 1. Encapsulant 124 has a surface formed on upper surface 70 of carrier substrate 20 that faces in a direction opposite to upper surface 70 and a surface, facing in a direction opposite to an upper surface 58 of printhead die 18 (18'), formed on an upper surface of a contact 120. Moreover, the configuration of Figure 10 would have to be altered in order for encapsulant 124 to have a surface that faces in the same direction as upper surfaces 70 and 58. Therefore, Applicant contends that it would not be obvious to alter Beerling et al. so that a mold can be used for dispensing an encapsulant to form a substantially co-planar surface with an upper surface of the fluid ejecting substrate and an upper surface of the carrier that faces in the same direction as the upper surfaces of the fluid ejecting substrate and the carrier. Thus, Beerling et al. does not include or suggest each and every recitation of claim 1, so claim 1 should be allowed.


Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-4 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2208.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09-16-05



Tod A. Myrum
Reg. No. 42,922

Attorneys for Applicant
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599